



City of Richmond

900 East Broad Street
2nd Floor of City Hall
Richmond, VA 23219
www.richmondgov.com

Meeting Minutes - Draft Urban Design Committee

Thursday, February 9, 2017

10:00 AM

5th Floor Conference Room of City Hall

Call to Order

Present -- 9 - * Chair Andrea Almond, * Chris Arias, * Andrew P. Gould, * Bryan Green, * Giles Harnsberger, * Vice Chair Andrea Levine, * Jill Nolt, * Robert Smith and * Committee Member Dawn Hicks

Roll Call

Mr. Arias arrived late to the meeting and was present from the consideration of the consent agenda on.

Present -- 9 - * Chair Andrea Almond, * Chris Arias, * Andrew P. Gould, * Bryan Green, * Giles Harnsberger, * Vice Chair Andrea Levine, * Jill Nolt, * Robert Smith and * Committee Member Dawn Hicks

Approval of Minutes

2. [UDC MIN 2016-006](#) Minutes of the June 9, 2016 Meeting of the UDC to be Approved

Attachments: [Minutes of the June 9, 2016 UDC Meeting](#)

Ms. Harnsberger made a motion to approve the minutes. Mr. Smith seconded and it was approved by unanimous vote with Ms. Almond, Mr. Green, Mr. Johannas, and Ms. Nolt excused because they were not present at the meeting.

1. [UDC MIN 2017-001](#) Minutes of the January 5, 2017 Meeting to be approved

Attachments: [Minutes of the 1/5/17 meeting to be approved](#)

Secretary's Report

Mr. Son stated that they had 2 banners to come through for approval and stated that one of them was for the A10 conference by the Coliseum along 5th street. Mr. Son stated that the other banner was for the Idina Menzel and her show that is coming to the Altria Theater.

Ms. Onufer stated that they reviewed Maymont parking lot that the Committee reviewed some years ago and now they're phasing the construction of the project and stated that they have found that they are currently planning to build all the new sections in accordance with the plans and then maintain the existing structure as is, which is in substantial compliance.

Consideration of Continuances and Deletions from Agenda

Ms. Onufer stated that there was one request from a committee member to move the Richmond Henrico turnpike from the consent agenda to the Regular agenda.

CONSENT AGENDA

A motion was made by Green, seconded by Gould, that this be approved. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye -- 10 - Almond, Arias, Gould, Green, Harnsberger, Levine, Nolt, Smith, Hicks and Johannas

3. [UDC 2017-07](#) Review of outdoor patio encroachment at Handcraft Building - 1501 Roseneath Road

Attachments: [Location & Plans](#)

[Staff Report to UDC](#)

Item UDC 2017-02 was moved to the regular agenda.

Mr. Green made a motion to approve the consent agenda. Mr. Gould seconded. It passed by unanimous vote.

4. [UDC 2017-05](#) Conceptual review of renovation and addition to Richmond Fire Station #21

Attachments: [Location & Plans](#)

[UDC Staff Report to CPC](#)

[Staff Report to UDC](#)

Agenda item UDC 2017-02 was moved to the regular agenda.

Mr. Green made a motion to approve the consent agenda. Mr. Gould seconded. It passed by unanimous vote.

6. [UDC 2017-01](#) Final review of Reedy Creek HQ Renovations

Attachments: [Location & Plans](#)

[UDC Report to CPC](#)

[Staff Report to UDC](#)

Agenda item UDC 2017-02 was moved to the regular agenda.

Mr. Green made a motion to approve the consent agenda. Mr. Gould seconded. It passed by unanimous vote.

REGULAR AGENDA

5. [UDC 2017-02](#) Final review of Richmond-Henrico Turnpike Roadway Improvement

Attachments: [Location & Plans](#)

[UDC Staff Report to CPC](#)

[Staff Report to UDC](#)

After the applicant addressed a series of questions regarding the guardrail from conceptual review there was public comment about stormwater concerns. The applicant

addressed these questions.

Ms. Almond inquired if they could be reminded of what their conceptual review comments were.

Mr. Son stated concerns brought up at conceptual review were material examples of the retaining wall in which the applicant answered that the proposed retaining wall material will be concrete and the attached VDOT Standard 401.03 depicts potential surface treatments. In addition, another choice may be to install a form liner to enhance the aesthetics. This finish will need to be selected by the City.

Another concern was the tree offset for the new plantings; The applicant response was that in accordance with former City Arborist's request (Mr. Luke McCall), the landscape plans indicate a 1/2 caliper replacement. In other words, proposed trees to be planted will equate to half the lost diameter.

Another concern was did the city arborist sign off on the proposed landscape plan? Applicant response was City Arborist, Mr. Luke McCall did not review/approve the current proposed landscape plan prior to leaving, but did specify the caliper replacement (1:2 or 1/2 as discussed above). Please note that this results in quite a few trees to be planted and the City may opt to consider reducing this number.

Another concern was material examples of the guardrail material, the applicant response was Guardrail material along Richmond-Henrico Turnpike will be galvanized and similar to the recently installed segment to the north of Fourquarean Dr. Please note that weathering steel will not be used due to high maintenance/replacement costs, the product is not approved by VDOT, and it may also compromise safety since it typically weakens as it rusts.

Another concern was that the pedestrian opening at Fourquarean and the Turnpike remains 8'-10' to which the applicant responded that the pedestrian opening at Fourquarean Drive /Richmond-Henrico Turnpike will remain open and accessible.

Mr. Johannas inquired if they we're reviewing in response to the conceptual review and Ms. Onufer stated yes and the applicant is here to answer questions.

Mr. Arias inquired if the galvanize steel guardrail was their only options and Mr. Mark Vasco stated they looked at the standard galvanized guardrail options but what they've found is that it's no longer approved by VDOT and it's a high maintenance issue. Mr. Vasco stated that it is weathered steel so it rusts and makes it a less safe guardrail installation and stated that in conjunction with Canon Creek Phase II Trail they did some significant improvements from Fourquarean Drive to Brookland Park and stated that entire segment is the galvanized guardrail. Mr. Vasco stated that it made more sense to them to continue with the galvanized and not break it up and have a significant amount of weathered steel around all of that given the fact that it is not approved and stated that they recommend that it be the galvanized that they proposed. Mr. Arias stated that it reaches a point of time when it starts to rust. Mr. Vasco stated that when VDOT goes around the state and surveys the conditions of their guardrails they have noticed that the guardrails rust until the point that there are voids in the guardrails and holes in the webbing. Mr. Vasco stated that is compromising the strength and integrity of the guard rail and stated that VDOT has inspected it and they are not okay with it. Mr. Vasco stated that they design as engineers for the safety, health and wealth of the general public and stated that when he hears something that is a safety issue they like to air on the side of caution.

Mr. Charles Price, speaking as a member of the public, stated that he is concerned about the water runoff due to the mosquito problem. Mr. Vasco stated that they designed the project in such that they wouldn't contribute any additional storm water

into that reveign area than currently exists and stated that they are increasing the amount of impervious area and they have installed on the east side of the roadway a curb and gutter and stated that there is a section inland and pipe there to divert some of the water to the south to where it will enter the CSO. Mr. Vasco stated that they feel that they have done everything that they can to minimize or keep at the current level of storm water that enters the reveign.

Ms. Almond made the motion to move consideration of the item to the regular agenda. Ms. Harnsberger seconded. And it passed by unanimous vote.

Ms. Harnsberger made a motion to recommend approval of the item as submitted. Mr. Gould seconded. It passed by unanimous vote.

8. [UDC 2017-06](#) Final Review of 17th Street Farmer's Market Plaza modifications

Attachments: [Location & Plans](#)
[Public Comment](#)
[Staff Report to UDC](#)

The committee had a discussion with the applicant about the proposed changes. They were uncomfortable with the lack of hardscape detail in the plan and recommended the applicant return with more clarification for another round of review by the UDC.

The application is for Final review of location, character and extent of 17th Street Farmer's Market Plaza modifications.

- Removal of the granite banding/cart paths, introduce brick band/bikeway.
- Change granite curbs to granite pavers (same dimensions on the top plane)
- Change plaza material from granite (poured granite) pavers to concrete with oak leaf imprinted into the concrete field
- Granite (poured granite) field surrounds SOD in the drawings. SOD is a placeholder for the fountain which will be installed as on original plans.

Ms. Almond inquired if they received any images or design ideas for the leaf imprint concrete ideas and Mr. Son stated that there was an example from a school building and they are very lightly pressed into the concrete.

Ms. Harnsberger inquired about the cart paths that was granite and whether or not there are going to be 2 separate pieces and what it looks like now and what the width is and Ms. Jennie Welliver, the project manager with Economic and Community Development, stated that at one point there were 3 bands of granite all the way down from Main to Franklin. Ms. Welliver stated that those granite cart bands had 2 on each side and stated that it cut the cobblestone field into 3 fields and stated that it is expensive and is not found in Richmond. Ms. Welliver stated that the project came in under budget so they have to scale it back somehow but states that they are not going to change the intent of the design and stated that the intention of this project is silver sills, big caliber trees that can live for 100 years and stated that the cobbles that are in there today they are going to do the same cobbles and think that they are going to look better. Ms. Welliver stated that in the middle field they are going to keep those materials that are found in Shockoe Bottom like bricks, cobbles and concrete and stated that the concrete is a cream bisque color from the mortar of the brick work along the edges. Ms. Welliver showed the Committee an overview of the project.

Ms. Almond inquired what the material is around the pop jet fountain is and Ms. Welliver stated that it is a paver material.

Ms. Harnsberger inquired if there was still bike and pedestrian traffic going on 17th

Street and Ms. Welliver replied yes. Ms. Harnsberger inquired if it was just for bikes and Ms. Welliver stated no. Ms. Harnsberger stated that the bike connector is great sending people through the market and asked if there was anything that manages the flow of bikes from Main Street up to Franklin and Ms. Welliver stated that in other when you get to the market place or businesses bikers slow down and stated that the plaza is for pedestrians and not really for bikes. Ms. Harnsberger inquired if the curb at Main Street side where the condition was beveled when it came before the Committee last time and inquired if it still beveled and is it accessible and Ms. Welliver stated that it is not beveled and will feather together into a higher plane.

Mr. Johannas inquired if it was poured concrete and Ms. Welliver stated yes. Mr. Johannas inquired if there was a particular pattern being done and Ms. Welliver stated yes.

Mr. Smith stated that they mentioned mercury vapor or high pressure and feels that it is a great opportunity to put LED in there now. Ms. Welliver stated that they are not bringing the lighting back for review but they are going to make it match. Ms. Almond stated that they reviewed and approved the lighting the last time they were here.

Mr. Johannas stated that there needs to be some more work on how they are putting the fields together and how they are going to be broken up.

Ms. Nolt made the motion to recommend deferral of the project and for the applicant to come back with more information on the design modifications and details of patterning changes and materials. The motion was seconded by Mr. Green and passed.

The UDC voted to defer recommendation of the item.

The applicant withdrew this item from consideration of the planning commission in order to revise and resubmit to the UDC.

Ms. Nolt made a motion to defer recommendation of approval of the item. Mr. Green seconded. It passed by unanimous vote.

Aye -- 9 - Almond, Arias, Green, Harnsberger, Levine, Nolt, Smith, Hicks and Johannas

Recused -- 1 - Gould

7. [UDC 2017-08](#) Final review of revisions to Monroe Park renovations

Attachments: [Location & Plans](#)
[UDC Report to CPC](#)
[Staff Report to UDC](#)
[Public Comment](#)
[Letter from Councilman Agelasto](#)
[Public Comment Presentations to UDC](#)

Mr. Green stated that back when they did the lighting study one of the questions was the difference in color temperature and inquired if this satisfy their safety concerns and Ms. Onufer stated that she has not heard any concerns raised from the police staff and stated that in general they have been using the 3000k color temperature as the standard for most of the LED projects. Ms. Onufer stated that there is a difference in lighting between the interior of parks and the exterior of parks and stated that the reason why the retention of the cobra heads on the street side which is a change from the 2009 plan in which she wouldn't imagine those being deleted is in response to

public safety concerns on the lighting of the road itself. Ms. Onufer stated that she has not heard any concerns raised in terms of considering this to be a under lighting of the interior of the park with regards to safety.

Ms. Levine stated that on the interior lighting what she is seeing in the sample packet is full exposure light and inquired if they are being capped or topped and Ms. Onufer stated capped.

Mr. Gould stated that if they make a motion to approve would they need to add that they have to come back for furniture and materials and Ms. Onufer stated that because they have not included samples or designated what those are going to be as part of this approval they would have to come back because they would not be able to approve the installation without that information.

Ms. Nolt inquired if there was an opportunity that Ms. Onufer would review those administratively and they would not come back to the Committee and Ms. Onufer stated that the only instance that would be reviewed administratively it would be the use of city standards that exists in locations that are already designated in the plan. Ms. Onufer stated that where they indicated they are using city standard bike racks and have indicated locations those are administrative and stated that they don't have a standard for movable tables and chairs yet they would need to return and come back.

Ms. Levine stated that by moving the bike racks into the interior of the park her concern is that they are encouraging cyclist to be riding in the park where she thinks it is more of a pedestrian park. Ms. Levine inquired if they are balancing that and asked are there still bike racks on the perimeter. Ms. Onufer stated that they are not proposing any bike racks on the perimeter as part of the park space but stated that there are still bike racks on the perimeter associated with the land uses around the park itself.

Mr. Green asked what the extent of the bio retention perimeter is was in 2009 versus what it is now. Ms. Onufer stated that they are extending deeper into the park space from the sidewalk and stated that they are reallocating length in response to existing fixtures or fixtures that needs to be maintained.

Ms. Nolt inquired if the project in its entirety came before them in 2009 was approved and Ms. Onufer stated correct as a final project. Ms. Nolt stated that there were parts and pieces like the furniture that didn't come before them and would require a follow up application and Ms. Onufer stated yes. Ms. Nolt inquired if she was correct that the project is under construction and Ms. Onufer stated yes. Ms. Nolt inquired what the protocol is when they haven't done a final review of the project in its entirety and the project starts construction. Ms. Onufer stated that they have allowed a project with a final review in hand can begin construction but they cannot in what they are tasked with where they would fall out of alignment and stated that they are taking an action in construction or have submitted plans for approval for an action in construction that are of substantial compliance with approved plans.

Mr. Don Summers, with Chief Capital Project Manager for the City, stated that one of the reason that they have brought these items back because as they worked their way through the project there has been an additional storm water review that is necessary as of 2012 code compliance. Mr. Summers stated that they had to resubmit for storm water review based on the new adoption and stated that they worked with various entities of the City, Public Works and Public Utilities to review various aspects. Mr. Summers stated that they had extensive dialogue with Public Utilities regarding the lights and they were able to work out the details to be able to go from a sustainability design aspect to LED lights on the interior. Mr. Summers stated that they also reviewed with DPW bike sharing possibilities and stated that they got dialogue from not only that division but also some input from VCU about the perimeter bike racks and getting them

moved to the interior of the park.

Ms. Nolt inquired if the project had been submitted for the modifications of the storm water management and has it been approved and Mr. Summers stated yes. Ms. Nolt inquired if this project that they are showing today is in compliance. Mr. Summers stated that in terms of moving toward the entrance ways the bio retention is approved the way it is designed but the entrance ways was one of the areas that they saw that putting in permeable pavers they will have the whole perimeter covered in terms of capturing some water and filtering that so that is one of the reasons they went to that particular item. Mr. Summers stated that it has been reviewed and approved.

Mr. Jay Hugo, Principal with 3 North the landscape architects of the project, stated that he wants to make a general overlay of the changes since it has been over 8 years since they approved the project. Mr. Hugo stated that it is exciting that the park project is moving forward and there have been a number of changes which includes regulatory changes, changes in best practices, changes in technology and specifications, changes to the members on the project team, new information and new perspectives. Mr. Hugo stated that to address some of the questions that came up there was a submission for furniture in the original packet that was approved so there are approved furnishings for the park however they do propose to come back with a new pallet of furnishings based on all the new reasons that he just mentioned. Mr. Hugo stated that the police involvement in the design both the City Police and VCU Police has been involved since the master planning effort and stated that as they may know the proposed current use for the second floor of the Checkers House is a Police substation that will be shared by the City and VCU Police. Mr. Hugo stated that he is not sure that the color rendition of the lighting has been discussed with the police but stated that they have an open dialogue with them and can make sure that is addressed. Mr. Hugo stated that regarding bio retention in 2009 submission to the UDC what they are seeing here is unchanged as far as the extent to that and they want to clarify that there were 2 drawings in circulation at that point and one of them didn't include the bio retention on Laurel Street so that is now been included in the project. Mr. Hugo stated that in reference to the comment from the public regarding the nature of the paths and the stone dust paths and stated that the path materials has been selected based on function and aesthetics and cost and stated that the stone dust proposal is really based on the history of the park during the period of significance and stated that they are proposing something that is going to tie the path together and make it a very hard surface where they don't have permeable pavers and stated that they do have ADA accessible surface.

Ms. Levine inquired how they were going to calm bicycle and skateboard traffic in the park. Mr. Hugo stated that through conversation with the rider people and Mr. Jake Helmboldt they are inviting bike traffic in the park and is identifying a path as a throughway and there will bollards at each end for bike traffic and stated that they are asking that they come through the park and the path are big enough for bike traffic and pedestrians like other shared use paths in the city. Mr. Hugo stated that the bringing the bike rack into the interior of the park it will make it more useful for park visitors that are using the amenities in the park.

Ms. Nolt inquired if they can share the vision or the design, pallet and intent of the trees and if they are any maintenance or succession plans for the trees as a whole. Mr. Hugo stated that the trees are the most critical design features for its success and for its use by the public and stated that the park has been in need of dire renovations for over 50 years and stated that the current work that they have undertaken and the construction that is underway is all initiated and informed by the Master Plan that was done by Roadside and Hartwell in 2006 through 2008 and it was accepted and adopted by the UDC. Mr. Hugo stated that master plan included a lot of community engagement and was led by the Monroe Park Advisory Council which has similar representation within

the council and stated that one of the goals of the plan was to create a balance of environmental consideration particularly the trees and storm water issues and the historic considerations which he can talk a little more about. Mr. Hugo briefly discussed the history of the park. Mr. Hugo stated that there were a number of trees proposed to be removed in the master plan that was also documented as to be removed in the 2009 submitted plans to the UDC were dying and declining trees and tree that were considered to be non-contributing and some smaller trees that were inconsistent with the period of significance. Mr. Hugo stated that a tremendous amount of work has been done in development the structure for the park and fundraising has allowed for construction to move ahead and stated that during that time another 19 trees were taken out of the park during that 8 year period. Mr. Hugo stated that they were taken out the City Urban Forestry Division for storm related issues and disease issues with the public safety in mind. Mr. Hugo stated that 13 more trees were taken out during construction due to disease and stated that they were documented by the City Urban Forestry Division and briefly discussed 6 other trees that were taken out because they were along the edge of the bio filtration structure because the root structure was going to get impacted and were very unlikely to survive.

Mr. Arias inquired when the trees in the tree wells along Franklin Street removed and Mr. Hugo stated that there is going to be an entire new perimeter street planting scheme of American Elms and stated that they are restoring existing LA's and a variety of species and stated that there are going to be over 130 new trees being planted in the park as part of the renovation.

Mr. Johannas inquired about the pattern of trees and Mr. Hugo stated that even though it began as a very regimented plan it's hard just through the depth and removal of trees through the years you can't recognize that pattern currently.

Mr. Gould Inquired about the net gain in trees and Mr. Hugo stated that it is a significant net gain in trees.

Mr. Arias inquired about the caliber of the trees and how tall are they at maturity and Mr. Hugo stated that they have a combination of Lindens, Maples and Tulip Poplar and stated that they are varying in sizes intentionally and stated that the Allay planting are unchanged from the original plan.

Ms. Nolt inquired if they are still on target to be planted at 3 ½ to 4 inch caliber and Mr. Hugo stated yes. Mr. Nolt stated that is a substantial size tree and stated that they are all canopy trees so over time they will grow into a tunnel effect along those pathways.

Mr. Arias inquired if they sit up off the ground not like a Crape Myrtle and Mr. Hugo stated yes and stated that the idea is to limb the trees up to improve site lines throughout the park.

Public comment

Ms. Amy Robins, Councilman Parker Agelasto's Liaison, read a statement from Mr. Agelasto in the minutes. First thank you for your service to the citizens of Richmond. The Urban Design Committee has an important role in the review of projects impacting public lands and buildings. Your review provides for an opportunity for citizens and professionals alike to engage in the approval process and offer input.

Monroe Park has received considerable attention from UDC and Planning Commission for nearly 10 years. City Council created the Monroe Park Advisory Council to further this work with citizen input. The Monroe Park Master Plan was the culmination of all this input. When City Council approved the agreement with the Monroe Park Conservancy, it did so with the expectation that the Master Plan would be followed and that the City's

review processes would be preserved. Over the last 3 years, I have been disappointed with the secrecy by which decisions affecting Monroe Park have been made. I have expended considerable time to get all parties to be transparent so trust can be established. One recommendation I shared was to specifically mark which trees would be removed during the construction. This conforms to the City's policy to post signs on trees scheduled for removal by Urban Forestry Division. For whatever reasons, this recommendation was not followed. It is sad to learn that UDC's previously approved tree plan was also disregarded without consultation. That is to say that UDC did not receive notice of the revised tree plan until January 2017 nearly two months after the plan was implemented and trees removed to accommodate the bio-retention plan. Given UDC's authority to approve such plans, an authority exercised on several occasions in the past pertaining to Monroe Park, it is alarming that the City Administration acted unilaterally without providing notice or seeking input from UDC. The changes before UDC to approve the tree plan are now a retrospective act. This request has given UDC almost no flexibility but to approve. At issue here is the Administration's failure to comply with procedures for adequate review of plans through City Council's board and commissions prior to execution. I therefore ask UDC to admonish the City Administration and require better cooperation in the future. As such I encourage you to formally request an investigation into how the Administration acted, and under what authority, so that those individuals responsible may be held accountable.

Mr. Todd Woodson, representing Oregon Hill Home Improvement Council Executive Director, stated that he spent 9 years with the Monroe Park Advisory Council and was humbled in 2005 when the Department of Parks and Recreation and the City Council awarded him and helping them to get this Monroe Park Advisory Council reestablished. Mr. Woodson stated that they are very pleased with the 2008 plan and stated that there are some things that happened in the last 2 months that are regrettable because there were trees being taken down in the park that was not authorized to be taken. Mr. Woodson stated that 7 of the trees were taken down because of Bio retention conflict and stated that bio retentions can't compare to a tree. Mr. Woodson stated that these trees could have been saved and stated that they were removed without a variance and stated that 7 trees were declared dead and were removed.

Mr. Charles Poole, speaking as a member of the Fan for Monroe Park, stated that a Gingko tree on Franklin Street was marked as dead and they removed this mature healthy tree. Mr. Poole stated that there was conflict in the date of which the trees were removed. Mr. Poole stated that these trees can live for hundreds of years and showed photos of the tree to the Commission. Mr. Poole stated that they fabricated a document to show that 7 trees were removed that were dead when they weren't dead and stated that he would urge this group if they vote on this plan today to take out the tree demolition plan and don't rubber stamp the plan and stated that they need to know why these trees were removed.

Closed Public comment

Ms. Onufer stated that as part of section 1707 as the City Charter states that: Whenever the commission shall have adopted a master plan for the city or one or more parts thereof, geographical, topographical or functional, and the master plan or such part or parts thereof and any amendment or extension of the plan or part thereof or addition thereto shall have been approved by the council and it has been certified and filed as provided in the preceding section, then and thereafter no street, square, park or other public way, ground, open space, public building or structure, shall be constructed or authorized in the city or in the planned section or division thereof until and unless the general location, character and extent thereof has been submitted to and approved by the commission. Ms. Onufer stated that is referencing the Planning Commission and

stated that ultimately location, character and extent authority drives from the master plan and the Planning Commission's role in approving and overseeing and enforcing the master plan. Ms. Onufer stated that they have multiple advice from the City Attorney over the years in terms of the particulars of what general location, character and extent for different items including a street, a square, a park or other public way, ground, open space, public building or structure. Ms. Onufer stated that the UDC is tasked to do here is approving the general, location, character and extent of this as a park and an open space. Ms. Onufer stated that the request of the removal of the trees diagram was at staff's request in order to be transparent with the public and UDC as a body as to why they are adjusting the planting plan and changing those plans across as part of this new approval. Ms. Onufer stated that the UDC is not a body that is tasked with overseeing the City of Richmond tree policy or operations and stated that she is not the staff to speak to those rules or policies but stated that they are tasked with providing a review of the general location, character and extent of the park including the mix of proposed plantings, overall planting plan and the retention general character of retention of existing trees in the park.

Mr. Johannas stated that they are not an enforcement body and stated that from what he see is the overall design plan have great respect for the historical bases for park even if some trees have been in the original design were large trees and stated that part of the process was to try and recreate more of a character of the landscape design where a large tree was removed he still might support that as a character location and extent approved direction for the park.

Mr. Johannas made the motion to approve the application as submitted.

Ms. Nolt inquired what date was the application received and Ms. Onufer stated that it was received January 19th. Ms. Nolt stated that she is agreeing with Mr. Johannas but stated that however she has been on UDC long enough to know that they sometimes get sidestepped in the process and stated that she knows there is nothing they can do about it except voice their opinion that they are approved and that they approved to sit on this Committee and that they take that with sincerity and that they volunteer their time with the city and when an opportunity comes up for them to bring something forward to this Committee and to the Planning Commission prior to the start of construction they expect that to happen. Ms. Nolt stated that she think the design changes before them are very acceptable in keeping with the master plan and also don't think they are a body that can review something that has already happened and stated that they are here to review the design of forthcoming construction fabrication. Ms. Nolt stated that if a motion is put on the table she would like to remove the content of the tree demolition because it is not in their purview. Mr. Johannas amended his motion to remove the content of the demolition of the tree. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gould and passed.

Mr. Johannas had made a motion to approve the plans as presented; Ms. Nolt requested that he amend the motion to remove the section on tree demolition from this consideration of the UDC due to the fact the trees have already been removed. Mr. Johannas agreed to amend his motion as such, as well as to incorporate the staff recommendation on LED color temperature.

Therefore, Urban Design Committee recommends that the Planning Commission grant final approval with the following considerations:

- That trees already demolished be removed from review as location, character, and extent**
- That the LED lighting be 3000K color temperature**

Mr. Gould seconded the motion. It passed by unanimous vote with Ms. Almond recusing herself.

OTHER BUSINESS

Adjournment